



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,926	09/29/2003	Gregory L. Sundberg	279.666US1	7372

42074 7590 05/10/2010

FAEGRE & BENSON LLP
PATENT DOCKETING - INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY (32469)
2200 WELLS FARGO CENTER
90 SOUTH SEVENTH STREET
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3901

EXAMINER

EVANISKO, GEORGE ROBERT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3762

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

05/10/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

e-OfficeActionBSC@faegre.com
djohnson2@faegre.com
rhale@faegre.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/673,926	Applicant(s) SUNDBERG, GREGORY L.	
	Examiner George R. Evanisko	Art Unit 3762	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-11 and 13-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-11,13-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/9/10 has been entered.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The specification does not contain the term “helical drive grooves” and it is unclear what this pertains to (whether it is the space between turns of the fixation helix or the helical groove in the piston). The specification does use the term “helical groove”, but that is in reference to the recess 162 in the piston.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-6, 8-11, and 13-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In the independent claims, the term “helical drive grooves” is vague. It is unclear what this pertains to since the specification only describes a helical groove in reference to the recess.

Art Unit: 3762

In addition, in claim 1 (and similar claims), line 6, "by the piston and having one or more helical drive grooves forming a drive mechanism..." is vague since it is unclear what element "and having..." is referring to (the helix or the piston) and since it is unclear what element "forming..." is referring to (the helix or drive grooves). It is suggested to state "the first portion of the fixation helix supported by the piston, the fixation helix having..., and the fixation helix forming..." to clarify the helix is comprised of those elements (if that is what is intended to be claimed).

In the independent claims, "partially recessed within the piston with a portion ...above an outer surface of the piston" is vague since "within" means on the inside. Although the specification does use the term "within", the specification also states that the recess/groove "[I]n one option, the recess 162 wraps around the exterior portion, for example, an outer perimeter of the piston 160" (page 5, line 16). Therefore it is unclear if the fixation helix is actually on the inside of the piston, "within", or just in a recess on the exterior of the piston.

In claim 3, "the recess" lacks antecedent basis. In addition, claim 3 seems to be saying the same thing as what is mentioned in claim 1 regarding the partially recessed helix, but it is unclear if they are the same.

In claims 4, 5, and 11, "the recess" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 3762

Claims 1-6, 8-11, and 13-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In the claims "one or more helical drive grooves" or "helical drive grooves", in combination with the other elements in the claim(s), was not described in the original disclosure. First, it is unclear what "helical drive grooves" pertain to in the specification (whether it is the recess/groove in the piston or the space between the turns of the helix). Second, the specification only states that there is "a groove" in the piston and not more than one. Finally, if the groove is helical, such as in the piston or between turns of the fixation helix, it would still only be one continuous groove and not multiple grooves. Therefore, it is suggested to use "a helical drive groove".

In addition, the use of "fixation helix supported by the piston and having...drive grooves forming a drive mechanism" (and similar language in other claims), in combination with the other elements in the claim(s), was not described in the original disclosure. The original disclosure stated "[A] fixation helix is supported by the piston at a first portion of the fixation helix, where the first portion of the fixation helix forms a drive mechanism that advances the fixation helix" (page 2, line 5 and throughout). It is suggested to use this language to describe the drive mechanism as it appears the guide rides along the first portion of the helix to drive the helix.

Art Unit: 3762

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by amendment.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George R. Evanisko whose telephone number is 571 272 4945. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on 571 272 4955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George R Evanisko/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3762

GRE
5/5/10